

Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and the Court's Orders." *[Id.]*.

The plaintiff has a constitutional right to proceed pro se, and the plaintiff has not indicated he is having difficulty meeting deadlines or understanding his obligation to prosecute his case in conformity with the scheduling order, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the Local Rules. Moreover, the plaintiff has not asked the Court to change any deadlines contained in the scheduling order.¹ Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the Court will extend the September 19, 2014 deadlines for both parties by 14 days. The Court will not, however, order the plaintiff to obtain counsel by a date certain, and the Court will not hold a scheduling conference to remedy what appears to be a hypothetical problem.

Accordingly, the defendant's motion, [R. 14], is **DENIED**; however, the September 19, 2014 deadlines in the scheduling order, [R. 5], are extended to **October 3, 2014** for both parties.

It is so ORDERED.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The defendant's desire for assurances going forward that the remaining deadlines in the scheduling order will not be subject to change should the plaintiff decide to retain new counsel later in the litigation is ironic considering the defendant is the movant currently requesting suspension of deadlines.